

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending for further examination.

Claims 1-8 were rejected as anticipated by Sato et al. (U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0126456).

Claim 1 is currently amended to recite that an optical communications module includes a rectangular chassis in which at least three of the longest side faces of the chassis are defined by dielectric wiring substrates having a metal part on an outer side and in which the metal parts “are soldered to one another.” Support for those features can be found in the examples discussed on pg. 7, lines 4-19 and shown in FIGS. 1(b) and 1(c) of the present application. In those examples, a chassis 4 includes a pair of dielectric wiring substrates 2a and 2b facing each other vertically and another pair of dielectric wiring substrates 2c and 2d facing each other horizontally. Metal plates 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d are formed respectively on the rear side of the dielectric wiring substrates 2a-2d. The metal plates 4a-4d can be fixed to one another using a method such as soldering. Soldering the metal plates together can, in some implementations, improve heat conduction between the plates.

In contrast, the Sato et al. reference does not disclose or suggest an optical communications module that includes a chassis having at least three of the longest side faces defined by dielectric wiring substrates as recited in pending claim 1. Instead, circuit board 26, mounting substrate 22, and support members 30, 32 of the Sato et al. patent (which the Office action alleges collectively correspond to the claimed “chassis”) are formed with, at most, only *two* side faces that correspond to dielectric wiring substrates (*see* FIG. 4, circuit board 26 and mounting member 22). The remaining longest side faces of the alleged chassis merely include conductive pins 22b.

In addition, the Sato et al. reference does not disclose or suggest that the metal parts formed on the outer side of the dielectric wiring substrates are “soldered to one another” as further recited by pending claim 1. Rather, the circuit board 26 and mounting member 22 of the Sato et al. patent are separated from one another by first and second support members 30, 32 (*see*

FIG. 4). Furthermore, because the support members 30, 32 provide “space for arranging electronic components *between* the circuit board 26 and the main surface of the mounting member 22,” it would not have made sense to solder the board 26 and member 22 to one another as this would reduce the amount of space for arranging electronic components.

At least for the foregoing reasons, claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Applicant : Takeshi Fujimoto et al.
Serial No. : 10/628,777
Filed : July 28, 2003
Page : 6 of 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 12852-017001 / 103063-US-00
K. Takahashi

The fee for the Petition for Extension of Time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/12/07



Samuel Borodach
Reg. No. 38,388

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Citigroup Center
52nd Floor
153 East 53rd Street
New York, New York 10022-4611
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291